

III. Remarks

The status of the claims is set forth in the above listing of the claims. In the Office Action, claims 26, 28, 31-43, 46, 47, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0115366 to Robinson (“*Robinson*”) in view of BEA “WebLogic Server and WebLogic Express Administration Guide,” September 6, 2002, Release 7.0 (“*BEA*”). Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections and objections outlined in the Office Action, the independent claims have been amended to expedite the allowance of the present application. No new matter was added. Applicant acknowledges with appreciate the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

IV. Arguments

Independent claims 26, 36, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 because they are allegedly unpatentable over *Robinson* in view of *BEA*.¹ The amended independent claims recite, in part, “processing, *on a parallel path*, the message according to a second messaging paradigm, wherein the processing the message according to a second messaging paradigm comprises *routing the message to at least one bridged destination associated with the at least one original destination*, and wherein a bridge associates a first of the at least one original destinations with a first of the at least one bridged destinations, and wherein the bridge is operable to automatically route the message to the first of the at least one bridged destinations, *and wherein an administrator may configure the bridge at a messaging provider*,” (emphasis added). The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Robinson* nor *BEA* teaches a system, method, or machine-readable medium which allows an administrator to configure a bridge at a messaging provider, as required by the amended independent claims 26, 36, and 47.

¹ See *Office Action*, pp. 3-9.

Claims 28-35, 37-43, 46, and 49-50 depend on one of independent claims 26, 36, and 47. Since these claims further limit a patentably distinct independent claim, the dependent claims are allowable on that basis as well as based on the additional patentably distinct limitations that they provide.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If any additional fees are required to complete this filing, or if an overpayment has occurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit such amount to Deposit Account No. 13-0480, referencing Attorney Docket No. TIB-015. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record if such would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. McCormack/

Brian C. McCormack
Reg. No. 36,601
BAKER & McKENZIE LLP
2300 Trammell Crow Center
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel: (214) 978-3007
Fax: (214) 978-3099

Date: December 9, 2011